REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable consideration of this application, in light of the present amendments and following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6, 12-15, 21 and 22 are pending in this application. Claims 1-22 have been presently amended. Claims 7-11 and 16-20 are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 23-79 have been cancelled without prejudice. No new matter has been added

In the non-final Office Action, Claims 1-6, 12-15, and 21-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-6, 12-15, and 21-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,289,450 to Pensak et al.

In response to the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection, Claim 1 has been amended to define that the recited document printing program is encoded on a computer readable medium. Applicants' Figure 1 shows a document printing program 111 as part of distributor terminal 101, and the specification on pages 12 and 13 describes that the distributor terminal 101 includes storage devices such as an external storage unit and a hard drive device, which would be understood to store program data. Thus, Claims 1 and 12 (and the claims dependent therefrom) now recite statutory subject matter. Independent Claims 21 and 22 have been similarly amended and also recite physical systems, which themselves are articles of manufacture, and thus also define statutory subject matter.

In response to the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection, the independent claims have been amended to clarify that the recited print requirement sets a print mode including at least one security requirement to be executed to a to-be-printed document.. Applicants' Figure 5 shows the print requirement set for example by the distributor using a screen (as shown for

example in Figure 5). The print requirement indicates to modify the print mode so as to add

on or more of a security level stamp, a digital watermark, and a background dot pattern.

Regarding the rejection over Pensak et al, Pensak et al merely discloses the encryption

and subsequent decryption of a document. See col. 6, lines 15-30. While Pensak et al later

describes that the authoring user 208 can prohibit a particular viewing user 216 from printing,

saving, or copying, this description at col. 6, lines 50-60, is not a disclosure of a print

requirement which sets a print mode including at least one security requirement to be

executed to a to-be-printed document.

Thus, with this feature not having been disclosed or suggested in Pensak et al,

independent Claims 1, 12, 21, and 22 (and the claims dependent therefrom) patentably define

over Pensak et al.

Consequently, in view of the foregoing discussion and present amendments and in

view of the identified allowable subject matter, it is respectfully submitted that this

application is in condition for allowance. An early and favorable action is therefore

respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

James J. Kulbaski
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 34,648

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)

Ronald A. Rudder, Ph.D.
Registration No. 45,618

I:\ATTY\RAR\AMENDMENTS (2008)\242873US\RESPONSETOOA12212007.DOC